

## **REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action dated March 17, 2008, it is noted that claims 1 – 17 are pending; that claims 1 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112; and that claims 1 – 5, 8 – 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112**

Claims 1 – 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1 – 3, 6, 8 – 10, 13 – 14, and 16 contain the phrase “configured to.” In the Office Action, it is alleged that it is not clear in the claims how the components described as such are “configured to” perform their respective functions, and as such, the claims are considered indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse such rejections.

Applicants submit that claims 1 – 16 are definite. This is because a person ordinarily skilled in the art would know how to configure the components to perform various functions based on the disclosures in Applicants’ specification, page 4, line 14 through page 7, line 17 and their equivalents.

For example, claim 1 requires:

*“a synchronizer that is configured to synchronize a change in the signalling output with a clock of the clocked device.”*

To configure the synchronizer to synchronize the change in the signalling output of the mousetrap buffer with the clock of the clocked device, a person ordinarily skilled in the art may refer to Applicants’ specification, page 4, lines 14 – 21, for an implementation example of the above requirements, and thus would know how to configure the synchronizer to perform the required functions.

Applicants submit that since the claimed elements are clearly supported by the specification, which contains exemplary ways of how the components are “configured to” perform their respective functions, a person ordinarily skilled in the art would know to do the configuration for the components. Therefore, claims 1 – 16 are definite.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 16 under 35 U.S.C. §112 is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1 – 4, 8 – 9, 14 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,392,423 (“Yetter”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,964,866 (“Durham” et al.).

Claims 5, 10 – 13, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yetter and Durham as applied to claims 1 – 4, 8 – 9, 14 and 17 above , and further in view of MOUSETRAP: Ultra-High-Speed Transition-Signaling Asynchronous Pipelines (“Singh” et al.).

### **Response to Arguments**

Applicants submit that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 – 5 and 8 – 17 are patentable over Yetter, Durham, and Singh, alone or in combination.

For example, claim 1 requires:

*“A pipeline synchronization device for transferring data between clocked devices having different clock frequencies.”*

In the Office Action, page 4, it is alleged that Yetta, (Fig. 8, items 802 and 804) discloses “clocked devices having different clock frequencies.” Applicants respectfully disagree.

Yetta, Fig. 8, apparently shows that pipeline stage (802) is clocked by the clock (CK1) and pipeline stage (804) is clocked by the clock (CK2). However, as disclosed in Yetta, column 14, lines 27 – 31, the clocks (CK1) and (CK2) are intended by design to switch simultaneously, to be ideally alternating (180 degrees out of phase), and to have a 50 percent duty cycle with respect to one clock state of the computer system’s clock. Since the clocks switch simultaneously, implying that they must make the same number of switching cycles per unit time, and therefore, they must have the same frequency. Thus, pipeline stage (802) and pipeline stage (804) are clocked devices with the same frequency. Therefore, Yetta, does not teach “a pipeline synchronization device for transferring data between clocked devices having different clock frequencies,” as claimed.

Applicants further submit that Durham, which relates to a processor having a data flow unit for processing data in a plurality of steps, does not in any way cure the above deficiency found in Yetta. Moreover, Applicants submit that Singh, which relates to ultra-high-speed transition-signaling asynchronous pipelines, does not add anything that would remedy the deficiency in Yetta.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Yetta, Durham, and Singh, alone or in combination. Independent claim 17 is believed to be patentable because it contains many similar distinguishing features as discussed in claim 1. Claims 2 – 5 and 8 – 16 should also be patentable because they depend from claim 1, with each claim containing further distinguishing feature. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 5 and 8 – 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

#### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims pending in this patent application are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

In the event there are any errors with respect to the fees for this response or any other papers related to this response, the Director is hereby given permission to charge any shortages and credit any overcharges of any fees required for this submission to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian S. Myers/  
By: Brian S. Myers  
Registration No.: 46,947  
For: Larry Liberchuk  
Registration No.: 40,352

**Please Address All Correspondence to:**

Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001